UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA WESTERN DIVISION

AMERICAN ZURICH INSURANCE COMPANY and ZURICH AMERICAN INSURANCE COMPANY,

Case No. 20-cv-5026

Plaintiffs,

v. COMPLAINT

J. CRISMAN PALMER and GUNDERSON, PALMER, NELSON & ASHMORE, LLP,

Defendants.

COME NOW the Plaintiffs, American Zurich Insurance Company and Zurich North American Insurance Company, by and through their counsel of record as shown below, and for their Complaint in the above matter, state the following:

PARTIES

- 1. The Plaintiff, American Zurich Insurance Company, is an Illinois corporation engaged in the insurance business with a statutory home office and a principal place of business in Schaumburg, Illinois.
- 2. The Plaintiff, Zurich American Insurance Company, is a New York corporation engaged in the insurance business with a statutory home office in New York, New York and a principal place of business in Schaumburg, Illinois. American Zurich Insurance Company and Zurich American Insurance Company will be hereinafter referred to collectively herein as "Zurich."

- 3. The Defendant, J. Crisman Palmer ("Palmer"), is an individual person who is a citizen and resident of the State of South Dakota.
- 4. The Defendant, Gunderson, Palmer, Nelson & Ashmore, LLP ("Gunderson Firm") is a domestic Limited Liability Partnership organized and existing under the laws of the State of South Dakota, with a principal place of business in Rapid City, South Dakota.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 5. The amount in controversy herein exceeds \$75,000.00.
- 6. The citizenship of the Plaintiffs is entirely diverse from the citizenship of the Defendants herein and jurisdiction therefore exists pursuant to 28 U.S.C § 1332.
- 7. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C § 1391 because all of the Defendants reside in this District and because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred in this District.

FACTS

- 8. On February 27, 2015, a Complaint (the "Leichtman Complaint") was filed in this District naming as defendants, among others, Zurich.
 - 9. The Leichtman Complaint was docketed in this Court as No. 15-5012.
- 10. The named Plaintiff in the Leichtman Complaint was an individual person, a citizen and resident of the State of South Dakota, named Joseph E. Leichtman ("Leichtman").
- 11. The Leichtman Complaint alleged Leichtman was an employee of Rommesmo Companies d/b/a Dakota Steel & Supply, Inc. between May 2001 and April 2009.
- 12. The Leichtman Complaint alleged Leichtman was injured in the scope and course of his employment, having suffered a fall on August 29, 2007.

- 13. The Leichtman Complaint alleged Leichtman suffered a compensable workers' compensation injury as a result of the above described fall.
- 14. The Leichtman Complaint alleged certain Zurich entities, including the Plaintiffs herein, provided workers' compensation insurance to Leichtman's employer.
- 15. The Leichtman complaint generally alleged certain Zurich entities, including the Plaintiffs herein, were guilty of "bad faith" with respect to the handling of Leichtman's claim for workers' compensation benefits.
- 16. Zurich retained Palmer and the Gunderson Firm, as legal counsel, to appear on their behalf in the matter of the Leichtman Complaint, to deny the claim of "bad faith," and to otherwise defend against the Leichtman Complaint.
- 17. The retention of Palmer and the Gunderson Firm by Zurich established an attorneyclient relationship among and between them, and necessarily established that Gunderson and the Palmer Firm owed certain fiduciary duties to Zurich.
- 18. As counsel for Zurich, Palmer and the Gunderson Firm filed an Answer to the Leichtman Complaint in a filing with this Court on April 30, 2015.
- 19. Neither Palmer nor the Gunderson Firm alleged any separate and distinct affirmative defenses as part of the Answer to the Leichtman Complaint filed on April 30, 2015.
- 20. Following the Answer, an Order was entered in the matter of the Leichtman Complaint, setting a deadline of August 31, 2015 for the parties to amend pleadings.
- 21. On September 7, 2018, Palmer and the Gunderson Firm filed a Motion to Amend the Answer they had filed on behalf of Zurich, seeking to, among other things, add several affirmative defenses never before pled.

- 22. The Motion to Amend filed by Palmer and the Gunderson Firm was filed more than three years beyond the deadline this Court had imposed for pleading amendments in the matter of the Leichtman Complaint.
- 23. On August 28, 2019, this Court entered an Order denying the Motion to Amend, stating, among other things, "woefully absent is any explanation for the delay of three years in bringing the motion [to Amend]."
- 24. At the time Palmer and the Gunderson Firm filed the Motion to Amend, they also filed, as Zurich's counsel, a Motion to Dismiss, asserting that the Leichtman Complaint should be dismissed based on, among other things, the new affirmative defenses of "release" and "res judicata" that the proposed amended Answer was seeking to assert.
- 25. When considering the Motion to Dismiss, the court refused to consider these affirmative defenses and denied the Motion to Dismiss, finding: "[b]ecause Zurich failed to plead release or res judicata in its original answer, both are deemed waived. As such, the court need not address the merits of either in the current Motion to Dismiss."
- 26. Because the Motion to Dismiss was denied, Zurich was required to continue defending the case, to the additional detriment and damage to Zurich.
- 27. The failure of Palmer and the Gunderson Firm to timely assert necessary and dispositive affirmative defenses amounted to legal malpractice and caused significant damage to Zurich, as related to their defense against the Leichtman Complaint.
- 28. The conduct of Palmer and the Gunderson Firm created a conflict of interest that potentially disqualified them from any further representation of Zurich, and negated the ability of

Zurich to make informed decisions as related to the legal representation they sought from Palmer and the Gunderson Firm, and the defense of the Leichtman Complaint.

COUNT I – BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY

- 29. As fiduciaries of Zurich, Palmer and the Gunderson Firm owed a duty to disclose to their clients the legal consequences of their failure to originally file necessary and dispositive affirmative defenses, their untimely delay in seeking an amendment to add necessary and dispositive defenses, and their inability to obtain court intervention to allow for an amendment to add necessary and dispositive affirmative defenses.
- 30. The duty to disclose owed by Palmer and the Gunderson Firm was ongoing, yet Palmer and the Gunderson Firm failed in making required disclosures to Zurich until the calendar year 2018.
- 31. Given their failure to disclose these legal consequences, Palmer and the Gunderson Firm breached their fiduciary duties owed to Zurich.
- 32. These breaches by Palmer and the Gunderson Firm were the cause of damages suffered by Zurich as related to their defense of the Leichtman Complaint.
- 33. Zurich suffered damages as a result of the breach of fiduciary duties owed to them by Palmer and the Gunderson Firm.

JURY DEMAND

COME NOW the Plaintiffs, and demand trial by jury of all issues so triable herein.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiffs pray for relief as follows:

a. For compensatory damages as determined to be appropriate by the fact finder herein as related to their claims stated in Count I; and,

- b. For the Plaintiffs' costs and disbursements herein; and,
- c. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and equitable in this action.

WHITFIELD & EDDY, P.L.C. 699 Walnut Street, Suite 2000 Des Moines, IA 50309 Telephone: (515) 288-6041

Fax: (515) 246-1474

Email: Doohen@whitfieldlaw.com

By <u>/s/ Stephen E. Doohen</u> Stephen E. Doohen

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS, AMERICAN ZURICH INSURANCE COMPANY and ZURICH AMERICAN INSURANCE COMPANY

JS 44 (Rev. 09/19)

Case 5:20-cv-05026-KES Document 1 Filed 04/20/20 Page 7 of 7 PageID #: 7

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

purpose of initiating the civil d	ocket sheet. (SEE INSTRUC	TIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF TH	HIS FORM.)	, 1		
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANTS	DEFENDANTS		
AMERICAN ZURICH INS AMERICAN INSURANCI		and ZURICH	J. CRISMAN PALMER and GUNDERSON, PALMER, NELSON & ASHMORE, LLP			
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			County of Residence	of First Listed Defendant	Pennington	
			(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.			
						(c) Attorneys (Firm Name,
Stephen E. Doohen, Whi 2000, Des Moines, IA 50		9 Walnut Street, Suite				
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	ICTION (Place an "X" in C	ne Box Only)	I. CITIZENSHIP OF P (For Diversity Cases Only)	RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintif and One Box for Defendant)	
☐ 1 U.S. Government	☐ 3 Federal Question			rf def	PTF DEF	
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government I	(U.S. Government Not a Party)		1 X 1 Incorporated or Pr of Business In 7		
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	,		Citizen of Another State	2		
			Citizen or Subject of a 3 3 Foreign Nation 6 6 6 Foreign Country			
V. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)		lly)	1 oreign Country	Click here for: Nature	of Suit Code Descriptions.	
CONTRACT		RTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine	PERSONAL INJURY ☐ 310 Airplane	PERSONAL INJURY 365 Personal Injury -	☐ 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 ☐ 423 Withdrawal	☐ 375 False Claims Act☐ 376 Qui Tam (31 USC	
☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability	Product Liability 367 Health Care/	□ 690 Other	28 USC 157	3729(a)) ☐ 400 State Reapportionment	
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	☐ 320 Assault, Libel &	Pharmaceutical		PROPERTY RIGHTS	☐ 410 Antitrust	
& Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act	t Slander ☐ 330 Federal Employers'	Personal Injury Product Liability		☐ 820 Copyrights ☐ 830 Patent	☐ 430 Banks and Banking☐ 450 Commerce	
☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans	Liability 340 Marine	☐ 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product		☐ 835 Patent - Abbreviated New Drug Application	☐ 460 Deportation ☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and	
(Excludes Veterans)	☐ 345 Marine Product	Liability		□ 840 Trademark	Corrupt Organizations	
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits	Liability ☐ 350 Motor Vehicle	PERSONAL PROPERTY ☐ 370 Other Fraud	LABOR ☐ 710 Fair Labor Standards	SOCIAL SECURITY ☐ 861 HIA (1395ff)	□ 480 Consumer Credit (15 USC 1681 or 1692)	
☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract	☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability	☐ 371 Truth in Lending☐ 380 Other Personal	Act ☐ 720 Labor/Management	☐ 862 Black Lung (923) ☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))	☐ 485 Telephone Consumer Protection Act	
☐ 195 Contract Product Liability	■ 360 Other Personal	Property Damage	Relations	□ 864 SSID Title XVI	☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV	
☐ 196 Franchise	Injury 362 Personal Injury -	☐ 385 Property Damage Product Liability	☐ 740 Railway Labor Act☐ 751 Family and Medical☐	□ 865 RSI (405(g))	☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange	
REAL PROPERTY	Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITIONS	Leave Act ☐ 790 Other Labor Litigation	FEDERAL TAX SUITS	☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions ☐ 891 Agricultural Acts	
☐ 210 Land Condemnation	☐ 440 Other Civil Rights	Habeas Corpus:	☐ 791 Employee Retirement	☐ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff	☐ 893 Environmental Matters	
☐ 220 Foreclosure ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	☐ 441 Voting☐ 442 Employment	☐ 463 Alien Detainee ☐ 510 Motions to Vacate	Income Security Act	or Defendant) ☐ 871 IRS—Third Party	☐ 895 Freedom of Information Act	
☐ 240 Torts to Land☐ 245 Tort Product Liability☐	☐ 443 Housing/ Accommodations	Sentence ☐ 530 General		26 USC 7609	☐ 896 Arbitration ☐ 899 Administrative Procedure	
☐ 290 All Other Real Property	☐ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities -	☐ 535 Death Penalty	IMMIGRATION		Act/Review or Appeal of	
	Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities -	Other: 540 Mandamus & Other	☐ 462 Naturalization Application☐ 465 Other Immigration		Agency Decision ☐ 950 Constitutionality of	
	Other 448 Education	☐ 550 Civil Rights ☐ 555 Prison Condition	Actions		State Statutes	
	1 440 Education	☐ 560 Civil Detainee -				
		Conditions of Confinement				
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" i	n One Box Only)			•	-	
		Remanded from 4 Appellate Court		erred from G 6 Multidistr er District Litigation Transfer		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO			ling (Do not cite jurisdictional state	tutes unless diversity):		
VI. CHOSE OF HETK	Brief description of ca	use; uciary duty				
VII. REQUESTED IN CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P. DEMAND \$ in excess of UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P. ST5,000 CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: ★ Yes □ No						
VIII. RELATED CASI	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE US Magistrate	e Judge Daneta Wollman		15-cv-05012-JLV	
DATE 04/20/2020 SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD /s/ Stephen E. Doohen						
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		181 81	chici E. Dooile			
	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP	JUDGE	MAG. JUI	OGE	